

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of pending Claims 1-29 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 13, 21, 23-25 and 27 stand objected to because of informalities. These Claims have been amended, and these objections are believed to be overcome.

Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 21 and 22 have been amended, and this rejection is believed to be overcome.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gottl et al., U.S. Patent 6,333,720. Claims 2-3 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottl in view of Le et al., U.S. Publication US 2005/0001778. Claims 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottl in view of Nesic et al, U.S Publication US 2004/0021613. Claims 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottl in view of Wood et al U.S. Patent 6,211,840. Claims 26-29 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottl.

Applicant affirms that claims 30-48 are withdrawn from further consideration without traverse.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 6-12, 15-20 and 24-25 are indicated as allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and/or rewritten to overcome objections set forth in the Office Action. Claim 22 is indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph.

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner indication of allowable subject matter in this application.

With regards to independent Claim 1, this claim has been rewritten to positively recite

elements which define the present invention over the cited prior art. Specifically, independent Claim 1 now recites an antenna having dipole elements adapted to provide the first and second beam having a 90 degree azimuth beamwidth. Support for this limitation is found in Applicants specification on Page 15, lines 7-14. Gottl et al fails to teach or suggest such limitations. Rather, Gottl teaches an arrangement providing beamwidths of about 60 degrees, as disclosed on Column 4, lines 7 – 9.

Please note Applicant has amended this application to confirm it is a Continuation-in-Part of the application from which priority was previously claimed. It is submitted the priority date for the applicable subject matter in this application predates the commonly assigned Le publication.

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1-29 are allowable over cited prior art, and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any other matters which remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve these matters by Examiner's amendment where possible.

No additional fees are believed due, however, should any other fees be due the Examiner is authorized to debit the deposit account 50-1752.

Respectfully Submitted,


Robert C. Klinger
Reg. No. 34,365
Attorney for Applicant

Jackson Walker L.L.P.
2435 North Central Expressway, Suite 600
Richardson, Texas 75080
(972) 744-2902
(972) 238-3302 – Fax